



BROOKER ENGINEERING, PLLC

NY OFFICE

74 Lafayette Avenue
Suite 501
Suffern, New York 10901

Tel: 845.357.4411
Fax: 845.357.1896

NJ OFFICE

22 Paris Avenue
Suite 105
Rockleigh, New Jersey 07647

Tel: 201.750.3527

April 4, 2019

Town of Clarkstown Technical Advisory Committee
10 Maple Avenue
New City, New York 10956

Attn: Jose Simoes, Principal Planner

Re: Suez Water New York Headquarters Site Plan (Tax Lot 59.10-1-1)
Narrative Summary (Plans dated 04/04/2019, Revision 2)
BBE # 18239

Dear Mr. Simoes:

Attached are eight sets of the Suez Water New York Site Plan for TAC review and comment. The project last appeared before TAC on February 13, 2019. The plans and EAF were circulated for lead agency distribution on March 11, 2019.

INFORMATION ENCLOSED

- Preliminary Site Plans, prepared by Brooker Engineering, Revision 2, dated 04/04/2019
 - Drawing 1: Title Sheet, Location Map, and Vicinity Map
 - Drawing 2: Preliminary Overall Site Plan
 - Drawing 3: Preliminary Site Plan – Part Plan
 - Drawing 4: Preliminary Grading and Utility Part Plan (Sheet 1 of 2)
 - Drawing 5: Preliminary Grading and Utility Part Plan (Sheet 2 of 2)
 - Drawing 6: Preliminary Sediment and Erosion Control Plan
 - Drawing 7: Existing Conditions and Demolition Plan
 - Drawing 8: Road Profiles
 - Drawing 9: Construction Details
 - Drawing 10: Tree Preservation Plan
- Planting Plan, prepared by Yost Design Landscape Architecture, Drawing L-7.01, last revised 04/02/2019.
- Lighting Plans prepared by RAB Lighting.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Suez New York is proposing to utilize the existing former Tilcon Building located on the east side of Old Mill Road as their headquarters building. This will provide offices for construction staff, management, and customer service employees. The existing main building will remain with no modification to the footprint; interior modifications are proposed as per the requirements of the new use. The existing building to the northeast will remain and be modified to provide conference rooms and training facilities. A 200' x 300' storage yard is proposed southwest of the existing building which will contain a 160'x65' building. The open yard will be used to park vehicle fleet and the building will store materials needed by Suez to maintain their water system, i.e. pipes, hydrants, valves, etc. This new building will have an office and restroom facility.

LAND DEVELOPMENT • MUNICIPAL • STRUCTURAL • WATER RESOURCES • LAND SURVEYING

Brian Brooker, P.E.	Eve Mancuso, P.E., C.M.E.	Ken DeGennaro, P.E., C.F.M.	Stuart Strow, P.E., C.F.M.
Anthony Riggi, P.E.	Dennis Rocks, P.E., C.F.M.	John Bezuyen, P.L.S.	Hillary Chadwick, P.E. Vincent Kane, P.E.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS, FEBRUARY 13, 2019 TAC:

1. **DEC:** *No written comments.*

2. **BI: 2/7/19**

Comment: Previous comments have been addressed.

Response: No response necessary.

Comment: Notes 16, 17 and 18 are not applicable to this project and shall be removed from the Title Page and Site Plan.

Response: Notes 16-18 have been removed from the Title Page and the additional standard site plan notes from the Planning Board application have been added.

Comment: Add map note that all accessory storage shall be within completely closed buildings.

Response: Site Plan Map Note 20 has been added to the site plan with respect to outdoor storage.

Comment: Clarify front yard setback and total number of parking spaces provided.

Response: Front yard setback has been corrected on the bulk table to 320.52 feet. Parking space calculations have been checked.

3. **THWAY:** *No written comments*

4. **TA:** *No written comments*

5. **PLANNING:**

Comment: The applicant will need to obtain Certificate of Appropriateness from the Town Board in order to perform work on the existing driveway on Old Mill Road as this is a Town designated Historic Road

Response: A separate application will be made to the Town Board.

Comment: Alterations to the existing tree line appear to be incomplete, particularly along the eastern portion of the site.

Response: The proposed woodline tie-ins have been corrected.

Comment: Additional drop curbs appear to be needed where internal sidewalks meet parking areas and curbing.

Response: Drop curbs have been added where internal sidewalks meet parking areas.

Comment: A tree preservation plan in accordance with Chapter 270 of the Town Code must be provided. As previously discussed, separate tree density calculations for the area of disturbance must also be provided.

Response: As per the TAC discussion, the tree requirements are replacement trees at a density of 17 trees per acre multiplied by the wooded disturbed land areas shall be the minimum replacement quantity. Disturbed areas that consist of pavement or grass with no trees shall not be applied to the tree replacement requirement.

Submittal Requirements

As per the list of required site plan exhibits, the following deficiencies must be corrected or a formal waiver requested from the Planning Board:

(2) The applicant shall submit a location map, at a scale of one (1) inch equals one thousand (1,000) feet, to show the position of the site clearly in relation to roads, public buildings, hospitals and public service facilities up to approximately five thousand (5,000) feet away, with the following information:

Response: Provided

(2) (a) Title, scale and North arrow, with the site shown shaded or hatched in.

Response: Provided

(2) (b) Streets and names (specify if county or state).

Response: Provided

(2) (c) Major public facilities such as schools and parks.

Response: Provided

(2) (d) Streams and water bodies, identified with the official number obtained from the Department of Environmental Control.

Response: Provided

3) The applicant shall submit a vicinity map, at a scale of one (1) inch equals two hundred (200) feet, to show the relation of general layout to surrounding area and facilities, in particular, any contiguous land in the same ownership up to the distance determined as adequate by the Department of Environmental Control or Planning Department to gauge the broad impact of the development upon the community, with the following information:

Response: Provided

(3) (a) Title, North arrow, scale, outlines of the site and tax block and lot numbers.

Response: Provided

(3) (b) Street pattern, with names and classifications as on the Town or County Official Map when other than a standard fifty-foot right-of-way.

Response: Provided

(3) (c) Lot pattern as on current Tax Maps (state the revision date), tax lot numbers, names of owners, the use of each property, buildings, driveways and parking areas.

Response: Provided

(3) (d) A superimposition of the proposed general layout, including buildings, driveways, etc.

Response: Provided

(3) (e) Existing drainage and sewer facilities affecting or affected by the subject site, unsized.

Response: Provided

(4) Preliminary site plan map:

(4) (a) The applicant shall submit a preliminary site plan map at a scale of one (1) inch equals twenty (20) feet or smaller if approved by the Department of Environmental Control as sufficient to illustrate field conditions and proposed development, with the following information:

Response: Waiver requested for mapping at a scale of 1"=30'.

(4) (a) [11] Existing public, mapped, private and undedicated streets (so indicated), showing the center line of the right-of-way for streets shown on the Official Map.

Response: Provided

(4) (a) [17] Single trees of over eight-inch diameter at four (4) feet above ground level. A Tree Preservation Plan in accordance with Town Code Section 270 needs to be provided. Trees over 8 inches in diameter must be shown and tree density calculations, based on these trees, are needed. Tree protection should be provided at the drip line or 80% of critical root radius, whichever is greater.

Response: Tree Preservation Plan has been included on Drawing 10.

(4) (a) [19] Zoning, school, sewer, fire and other district boundary lines.

Response: Provided

(4) (a) [30] Outlines, in plan and elevation, of all proposed structures, including doorways and outdoor signs and information relating to color and lighting.

Response: Provided

6. FI: 2/8/19

Comment: Hydrant requested shown at north end of building by dumpster enclosure.

Response: No response necessary; a proposed hydrant is located at the north end of the building by the proposed dumpster.

Comment: Request that an additional hydrant be provided in close proximity to driveway to vehicle storage lot at south side of property.

Response: An additional hydrant has been added at the south side of the property, northwest of the proposed building.

Comment: Access to parking area through gates will be required for emergency vehicles with minimum of delay.

Response: We will coordinate appropriate access through security gates for emergency vehicles. This is referenced as map note 23.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

J. Simoes made the following comments:

- Comment:** The Certificate of Appropriateness must be obtained by the Town Board prior to any construction at the site. Other applicants have petitioned the Town Board after obtaining a SEQR determination from the Planning Board, but it doesn't necessarily have to be done in that order.

Response: An application for a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Town Board will be made shortly.

- Comment:** Provide the plant and tree specimens on the landscape plan.

Response: Plant and tree specimens are provided on the Landscaping Plan (Drawing L7.01).

- Comment:** Lengthy discussion ensued regarding how the requirements and spirit of the Tree Preservation law can be applied to this site.

Response: As per this discussion, the tree requirements are replacement trees at a density of 17 trees per acre multiplied by the wooded disturbed land areas shall be the minimum replacement quantity. Disturbed

areas that consist of pavement or grass with no trees shall not be applied to the tree replacement requirement.

- D. Letson made the following comments.
- 1. **Comment:** *The 17 tree per acre requirement applies to both the areas to be disturbed and the overall site.*
Response: Replacement trees have been added at a density of 17 trees per acre over the disturbed wooded areas. The overall site exceeds the 17 tree per acre requirement based on the sample trees surveyed on the east side of the access drive. As shown on the "Tree Density Calculations" on Drawing 10, the density based on the representative area selected is 96 trees per acre.
- 2. **Comment:** *The intent of this requirement is to avoid having large, heavily wooded parcels with smaller developed areas with no trees.*
Response: Replacement trees have been added at a density exceeding 17 trees per acre over the disturbed wooded areas.
- 3. **Comment:** *He advised the applicant that tree calculation is based on trees over 8 inches in diameter. Smaller trees should be removed from the calculation.*
Response: The tree calculations are based on trees eight inches in diameter and greater.
- **Comment:** *It was agreed that the tree preservation plan and associated calculations should include any work being done in wooded areas (wood line to wood line) and the area of work associated with the main driveway. The large grassy area that currently has no trees can be excluded.*
Response: As per this discussion, the tree requirements are replacement trees at a density of 17 trees per acre multiplied by the wooded disturbed land areas shall be the minimum replacement quantity. Disturbed areas that consist of pavement or grass with no trees shall not be applied to the tree replacement requirement.
- **Comment:** *J. Simoes inquired how the adjacent lots owned by Tilcon should be included in this application and whether Tilcon should be included as a co-applicant.*
Response: Tilcon is referenced on the Site Plan as the owner and has signed the application as the owner. Suez is the applicant and lessee of the property.
- **Comment:** *G. Moreno stated that there are three lots owned by Tilcon surrounding the subject lot.*
Response: No response necessary; these lots are shown on the Site Plan.
- D. Letson made the following comments:
- 1. **Comment:** *Inquired about any access agreement between Suez and Tilcon. G. Moreno responded that Suez has been granted access via the adjacent lots owned by Tilcon.*
Response: Proposed access easements are shown on Drawing 2.
- 2. **Comment:** *Recommended that the other affected lots not be included in this site plan application and suggested that the applicant obtain a formal access agreement allowing Suez to modify the existing access roadway and perform all related grading and ancillary work necessary to provide compliant driveway access.*
Response: Access easements and construction easements have been added to the Site Plan over the lots that provide access (tax lots 59.10-1-69 and 59.10-1-4) to the subject lot (tax lot 59.10-1-1).
- 3. **Comment:** *Inquired whether such an access agreement would be sufficient to allow the application to proceed without the inclusion of the affected lots. P. Schofield responded that it would be sufficient for this purpose.*
Response: No response necessary.
- 4. **Comment:** *The applicant was advised to provide a draft of the agreement to the Town Attorney's office for review. G. Moreno responded that the existing agreement between Suez and Tilcon may already address this issue.*
Response: This agreement will be provided under separate cover.
- 5. **Comment:** *The applicant was advised to redact portions of the agreement if necessary and provide a copy to the Town Attorney's office for review.*
Response: This agreement will be provided under separate cover.
- **Comment:** *C. Maneri noted that the permissions should include the access to the existing house on 59.10-1-69.*
Response: The easements have been added to include providing access to the existing house on tax lot 59.10-1-69.
- **Comment:** *J. Simoes noted that as the owner of the property, Tilcon will have to sign the Planning Board application and mylar.*

Response: Tilcon has been added to the signature block as the owner.

Comment: P. Schofield inquired how SEQR is being handled. D. Letson responded that the SEQR review will include all of the lots.

Response: No response necessary.

- **Comment:** K. DeGennaro inquired whether the 24 foot width and 10 % slope is acceptable for the public roadway. D. Letson responded that it is acceptable.

Response: No response necessary.

- D. Letson made the following comments:

1. **Comment:** Requested that lighting similar to street lighting be installed along the driveway, especially around the curve for the benefit of those working at night.

Response: Street lighting is shown along the existing driveway.

2. **Comment:** Advised the applicant of the recently adopted changes to the Stormwater Management requirements. (See Resolution #77-2019 passed on February 5, 2019) K. DeGennaro responded that the additional requirements should not be a problem for this application.

Response: Peak stormwater runoff rates have been reduced by at least 10% for the 10-, 25, and 50- year design storms per the latest Stormwater Management requirements for the Town of Clarkstown. This is included in the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.

- **Comment:** K. DeGennaro stated that the landscape plan will include additional vegetation by the parking lot and screening on the downhill side of the storage yard.

Response: No response necessary; the landscaping plan contains vegetation and screening at the parking lot and downhill side of the storage yard.

- C. Maneri made the following comments:

1. **Comment:** Advised the applicant to remove the incorrect standard notes from the title page and the site plan page.

Response: Standard map notes have been corrected.

2. **Comment:** Provide the height of the building.

Response: Height of the building has been added to the site plan.

3. **Comment:** Expressed concerns about nighttime lighting disturbing nearby residents. G. Moreno responded that the applicant plans to have as many lights on timers as possible to reduce the amount of lighting on the site.

Response: The lighting plan has been prepared that shows no light spillage onto the neighboring properties. We also note that the existing parking lot close to the residences along the north property line has been reduced and the limits of this parking lot are now 77 feet away from the property line (22 feet under existing conditions). This area is also being replanted with additional screening vegetation, and lights in this parking lot will be on a seasonal timer.

- **Comment:** G. Moreno stated that after hour's employees will be parking in the south lot and walking to the building.

Response: No response necessary.

- D. Letson made the following comments:

1. **Comment:** Advised the applicant to provide multiple plan sheets showing various lighting scenarios at different times of the day and under different circumstances.

Response: A Lighting Plan has been developed to incorporate the full anticipated range of employee activity. Normal hours of operation are 8:00 am - 4:30 pm, which means lighting is not typically required. This will require some lighting in winter months, which will be on a seasonal timer to go off at 6:00 pm. Additional parking and sidewalk areas could be used after hours which would be activated upon entry on site of employees using their security card upon entrance at the selected gate. These lights would turn on when the employee uses their card to open the gate, after which the lights would be on a timer. The Lighting Plan is shown under the worst case scenario when all lights are on. The full range of anticipated lighting is shown on the Layout Plan (Drawing 2) and consists of:

<u>Area</u>	<u>Type of Fixture</u>	<u>Light timer</u>
Access Road	Pole Lighting	Seasonal timer
Front Parking Lot (Visitor Parking)	Pole Lighting	Seasonal timer
Front Parking Lot (Employee Parking) – Northeast and East Lots	Pole Lighting	Seasonal timer and card activated timer

South Parking Lot (Employee Parking)
Sidewalks between storage building and
main building

Pole Lighting
Bollard Lighting

Card Activated timer
Seasonal timer and card activated timer

2. **Comment:** *Advised the applicant to review the standard notes as there appear to be errors.*
Response: Standard Site Plan notes have been corrected.
3. **Comment:** *Advised the applicant to change any reference to the "ALC" to the "AHRB" and noted that the landscape guarantee is now 3 years.*
Response: Map note 16 has been changed to reflect this.
4. **Comment:** *Instructed K. DeGennaro to check to see if Lake DeForest is on the county stream map, which would trigger a GML review. (Subsequent to the meeting, it was determined that a GML review is not required.)*
Response: No response necessary; a GML review is not required.

Very truly yours,



BROOKER ENGINEERING, PLLC
Kenneth DeGennaro, P.E.